1	14-21 - INFORMATION & SCOPING MEETING - GRAND RAPIDS		
2	JULY 24, 2014 - 11:00 A.M.		
3	FOR THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,		
4	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,		
5	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY		
6			
7			
8	In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Route Permit for the Great Northern High-Voltage Transmission Line Project from Manitoba, Canada - Minnesota Border to the Blackberry Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota		
9			
10			
11	PUC DOCKET NO. E-015/TL-14-21		
12			
13			
14			
15	Sawmill Inn		
16	2301 Pokegama Avenue South Grand Rapids, Minnesota		
17	Grand Kapids, minnesota		
18	July 24, 2014		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	COURT REPORTER: Janet Shaddix Elling, RPR		

		2
1	I	N D E X
2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Tracy Smetana	3
4	David Moeller	22
5	Bill Storm	27
6	Carol Overland	48
7	Richard Libbey	51
8	Cavour Johnson	58
9	Bob Nick	60
10	Delores White	65
11	Linda Castagneri	66
12	Mark Walsh	68
13	Dave Roerick	75
14	Darrell White	76
15	Carol Overland	78
16	Ron Gustafson	79
17	Carol Overland	80
18	Harvey Wahlquist	87
19	Richard Libbey	89
20	Darrell White	93
21	Bob Walsh	95
22	Cavour Johnson	98
23	Richard Libbey	99
24		
25		

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Well, again, good morning and welcome, everyone.

My name is Tracy Smetana, I'm the public advisor with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission.

And we're here for the public information and scoping meeting for the Great Northern Transmission Line Project that Minnesota Power has proposed.

I've included on this opening slide the Public Utilities Commission docket number. That's sort of the key to finding information with our So if you're communicating with us or looking for information, that's the number that you want to remember.

So what we're going to talk about this First off, we're going to talk about the route permit roles and process. And I will be speaking to that as well as the U.S. Department of We're going to ask Minnesota Power to provide a brief description of the project. then the environmental review piece will be handled by the Department of Commerce and, again, the U.S. Department of Energy. And, of course, the main event for today is your comments and questions.

Just briefly, who is the Public Utilities Commission. We are a state agency and we're charged with regulating various aspects of the utility industry, including the permitting for transmission lines.

We have five commissioners appointed by the governor. They serve staggered terms and it's a full-time job for those folks. So different from, say, a small-town city council, where, you know, they might have a few meetings a month, these are folks that come into the office every day, Monday through Friday. And we also have about 50 staff.

A little bit more about who's who in this route permit process that the Public Utilities

Commission oversees.

First off, we have the applicant. That's what we call the company asking for the route permit. So in this case that's Minnesota Power.

The Department of Commerce, Energy
Environmental Review and Analysis, which you might
see abbreviated as EERA. They're another state
agency and their job is to conduct the environmental
review, and you'll hear lots of details about that a
little bit later.

Later on in this process we will ask an

administrative law judge from the Office of
Administrative Hearings to get involved to help us
do some fact-finding, make sure we have all the
facts in the record. The judge will come back out
here and hold public hearings probably in the spring
of next year. And then once the record is complete,
the judge will provide a summary of all the facts in
the record for the Public Utilities Commission and
make recommendations about this project.

We also have the U.S. Department of Energy. And their responsibility is to do the environmental review when a presidential permit application is submitted.

And then with the Public Utilities

Commission, again, you might see that abbreviated as

PUC, there are a couple different staff members that

you might interact with throughout this project.

The first is our energy facilities planner, that

person deals more on the technical aspects of the

project, assists in building the record, advises the

Commissioners on impacts of various options that

exist.

And then the other is the public advisor, that's me. And my job is to work with citizens to help you figure out when do you plug into the

process, when can you submit comments, when are the meetings going on, how does the process work. In either case, the Commission staff, we're not giving you legal advice, we're not advocating for one position or another. Our job is to just provide the facts and provide information so that you can choose where you need to go with that.

So why is the Public Utilities Commission involved in this particular project? Well, the statutes and rules define it as a high voltage transmission line. And that means they need a route permit before they can build this project from the Public Utilities Commission. And I've included information here on the statutes and rules, so if you're looking for some really interesting bedtime reading, this would be a good place to go.

Now, the other piece of this project is what we call a certificate of need. And that's going to answer the question is this project needed. And, again, because of the size of this project, the state requires a certificate of need from the Public Utilities Commission as well. So two different approvals that the company needs from the Public Utilities Commission before this project can go in the ground. The first is certificate of need, is

the project needed. The second is the route permit.

If it's needed, where is it going to go.

The certificate of need is being handled in a separate process. Some of you may have been out when we were here in February talking about certificate of need questions. That project -- or that process is still in the works, no decision has been made yet.

So how does the Public Utilities

Commission decide on the route? Well, there's a variety of factors that are identified in the statutes and rules. And I'm not going to read through all of them because I'm assuming most of you picked up the slides on your way in, but you can see there's a pretty comprehensive list of the various factors.

Now, what happens is the statutes and rules don't tell us which things are most important. So you might think human settlement is most important, your neighbor might think tourism is most important, and so what's going to happen throughout the process is folks are going to discuss and debate, you know, sort of the ranking or the weighting of these various factors through the process. And ultimately it's up to the Public

Utilities Commission to make a decision on where the route would go.

So if indeed a route permit is granted in this case, there's some various terms that you might see or hear that you might want to know about.

The first is what we call the permitted route. And that's sort of the wide area that the company would have authority to build the line in. So it's just the location kind of from point A to point B. And the width is going to vary along that route. It can go up to 1.25 miles, so a pretty good section of land. When we get smaller within that permitted route area, we get to what we call the right-of-way, and that's the land that's actually needed to build and maintain the line. And then we get smaller yet to what we call the anticipated alignment and that's where the company expects the line will actually go within that right-of-way.

If a route permit is issued, obviously the company needs a place to build it, right, and so there is various ways that the company will acquire land to do that. The first is an easement that would be negotiated between the applicant, Minnesota Power, and the landowner. In this particular case, state law also allows the company to go through the

eminent domain process if that negotiation fails.

And there is a court process that deals with that.

And, again, I'm not giving you legal advice, just throwing out these terms so that you have information on where to go next. And that is also referenced in the statutes there.

There is another statute that is referred to as the Buy the Farm statute. In some cases the landowner may require the company to purchase the land. And there's a handout in the back that you may have picked up on the way in that talks in greater detail about all of these aspects. If you have questions about that, I would definitely recommend you pick that up and read through that.

So here's a little chart that shows sort of a high level of what the process looks like.

This is a similar process to what that certificate of need will be going through, it's just on a different schedule, if you will. And so you can see we're at box number 2 right here, the public information and scoping meetings. And so there's a number of steps that have to occur before we get down to the end of a decision on this route permit. And there are a number of opportunities along the way for you to become involved.

As I mentioned earlier, there will be public hearings back out here in the spring with an administrative law judge, there's also various other opportunities for you to submit written comments and so forth throughout the process.

If you like a list better than a picture, this is your slide. It gives essentially the same information as the previous one, only in a list form, and with some estimated timelines. And the key word here is estimated. This is likely to change, probably more than once as we go through the process. For a project this large and complex, things will come up along the way that may cause changes to this timeline. But you can see again right now, we're in July 2014 for the information and scoping meetings, and we're anticipating a Public Utilities Commission decision in October of 2015. So we've got a ways to go and a lot of steps to complete between now and then.

So, as I mentioned, one of the ways that folks can weigh in is by submitting written comments to our office. And when we're accepting comments on various topics throughout this process, we will issue a notice to tell you, hey, what's going on, what questions are we looking for answers to right

now. And so I just wanted to -- this is an old one, as you can see, from back in April, but I just wanted to use it as an example to show you sort of the key elements you want to pick out if you receive one of these notices in the mail.

So first off is the docket number.

Again, that's the key to everything in our office so it's always helpful to have that information handy.

The comment period. So it's not just an open-ended where we're looking for answers to these questions for ever and ever and ever, we have a deadline, 'cause we need to keep moving through those steps that were on the previous slide. So you want to pay attention to those deadlines because if it comes in after the deadline we can't use it anymore because we're already moving on to the next thing.

The other thing to pay attention to is the topics open for comment. Now, on the notice that you received in the mail or that you may have seen in the newspaper, there was a list of topics that we were looking for answers to for this meeting. Back in April and May we were looking for answers to different questions. So if someone submits answers to these questions today, it's really not useful because we've already made

decisions about that and we've moved on.

Now, if you're looking for more information after today's meeting, there's a variety of ways that you can do that. We do have what we call an eDocket system, it's the official record where we keep everything that comes in in this case. So Minnesota Power's application for this route permit is included here, any comments that you submit will be included here, and you can just follow these steps and look at these documents right online.

We also have a project mailing list where you can ask to receive information either by U.S. mail or by e-mail to let you know when opportunities to participate are coming up. So you would receive notices about things like future meetings, comment periods, when the environmental document is available, and so forth. You can complete one of the orange cards in the back to sign up for that today, or if you forget to do it today and you decide later you'd like to, you can contact our office to take care of that.

Now, if you say, hmm, getting information about the meetings and comment period sounds great, but there's a lot of other information out there,

and I think I might want to hear even more. We have an e-mail subscription service where you can subscribe to receive a notice every time something new comes in. So if you're an e-mail person, this is a good idea. If you don't like e-mail that much, this is probably not a good choice for you because you could end up getting a lot of e-mail. The instructions are here and you can just follow those to get on that subscription list.

This is just a picture of what that screen looks when you go to subscribe. A lot of people say it's not very user-friendly, so I always like to give you a picture so you can see exactly what you're supposed to enter in all of those different places and then you'll go ahead and start receiving those e-mails.

Again, at the PUC, the Public Utilities Commission, there's two different folks that you might interact with as part of the process. The first is me, again, my name is Tracy Smetana, I'm the public advisor. We also have our energy facilities planner, Michael Kaluzniak, and he is here in the back of the room. So if you have questions for either of us we'll definitely be around after sort of the presentation part of the

meeting is completed.

And with that I'm going to turn it over to Julie Ann Smith with the Department of Energy.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: Hello and good morning.

My name is Julie Ann Smith and I work for the United States Department of Energy. I'm with the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

I would like to thank you all very much for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend this meeting today. Your presence and input are vital to a robust public participation process.

This is a scoping meeting, which means that it is about me, or the DOE, listening and learning from you. The DOE needs to hear what issues you think that we should consider when we conduct our environmental analysis.

The reason that we are here today is that Minnesota Power is proposing to construct the Great Northern Transmission Line Project, an international transmission line, and they've asked the Department of Energy for a permit to cross the U.S./Canadian border. Minnesota Power submitted a presidential permit application to the Department of Energy in

April of 2014.

Before any electric energy transmission facility can be built across the U.S. international border, the project proponent, or applicant, must obtain a presidential permit from the U.S.

Department of Energy. A DOE presidential permit authorizes a company to construct, operate, maintain, and connect electric transmission facilities at the border.

The DOE is involved in this proceeding for one reason. The proposed transmission line would cross the international border. If this line did not cross the border I would not be here with you today.

The DOE has no authority in the actual siting of this line. Only the State of Minnesota, specifically the Minnesota Public Utilities

Commission, has that authority. The Department of Energy does not convey rights of eminent domain with its presidential permit, nor can the DOE address issues of compensation for lands that would be impacted by the Great Northern project.

However, before DOE can issue this kind of permit, we must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, or as we like to call it,

NEPA. NEPA is a federal law that serves as the nation's basic charter for environmental protection.

It requires that all federal agencies consider the potential environmental impact of their proposed actions.

NEPA is based on a set of principles, full disclosure and public participation. Again, this is why we're here. This enhances understanding on all sides.

We also have to explore alternatives to the action, including a no action. And for the DOE federal proposed action, no action would be the nonissuance of the presidential permit.

We have to assess the potential impacts of all of those alternatives with rigor and in an apples-to-apples type of comparison. We have to consider mitigation or ways to reduce or avoid impacts that we've identified and weigh options and explain those decisions clearly in the environmental analysis document.

At the end of the day, NEPA promotes better informed agency decision-making and provides you the opportunity to learn about the agency's proposed actions and to give us timely information and comments about what it is that we're proposing

to do.

In terms of process, NEPA has been referred to as an umbrella statute. It's a one-stop shop that allows agencies and developers to comply with numerous individual environmental, health and safety related laws for which we're responsible. So we will be analyzing potential effects from the proposed action of granting the presidential permit to numerous resource types, including biological resources, as well as those that include human issues or human concerns, including environmental justice or recreation.

For this proposed project, the Department of Energy determined that the appropriate level of environmental analysis is to be an environmental impact statement, or an EIS. From our point of view, an EIS essentially tells the complete story of a proposed project. The Great Northern EIS will analyze all the foreseeable environmental impacts that might flow from our granting of a presidential permit. The EIS will also identify steps that might be needed to mitigate those environmental impacts.

There are other federal agencies involved in the creation of this EIS, and those include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District, as

well as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They have permitting or oversight authority for the proposed facilities within their respective jurisdictions. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency to the Department of Energy currently in the preparation of this environmental impact statement so they are involved in this preparation moving forward.

Again, we are here to listen and to get your comments and suggestions for the issues we should be addressing in the EIS. We would also like to know any alternative routes or route segments for the proposed project. And Bill Storm, my colleague at the Minnesota Department of Commerce, will cover this in more detail a little bit later.

Just a little overview of our federal process and what you all can anticipate in moving forward over the next year, year and a half. We are in the scoping comment period, the yellow circle.

Once the scoping period closes in mid-August, we will get to work on preparing the draft environmental impact statement. That will take us several months to do that work.

Once the draft is completed, it'll be made public and posted on our website, which I will

show a little later, as well as the state's websites, and distributed to everyone on our mailing list. So, again, if you want to be on the mailing list, you can sign up on the back table by filling out a card and you'll receive the document when that is made public in the format you would like it. You can also sign up a little bit later at the various websites to make sure that we capture your name on the list.

After the draft is released there will be a 45-day comment period for you to submit -- for you to review the draft EIS, to look it over, read it, and then submit comments to us about maybe what we've missed or give us some new information to help our analysis.

During the comment period on the draft EIS you'll be able to, again, submit comments, either in writing or by e-mail. And then I will also be coming back -- along with my colleague Chris Lawrence, will coming back here to Minnesota to hold public hearings to hear in person and to receive oral comments on the draft EIS.

After the close of the comment period on the draft, we will then go to prepare the final EIS. Every comment received on the draft EIS will be

included in the final EIS. And we will respond in the document to every comment that we receive.

When the final EIS is complete, it will again be made public. It will be sent to everyone on the mailing list and will be posted to the websites. By law, the Department of Energy may not make a final decision on the Great Northern Transmission Line presidential permit application until 30 days after the publication and public release of that final environmental impact statement. And that would result in the final green box, which is called the record of decision.

At the completion of this EIS process, the Department of Energy may or may not issue the presidential permit. If the DOE were to issue the presidential permit, the transmission line and associated facilities could not be built unless and until all other state, local, and federal permits are obtained.

For this meeting, you can see we have a court reporter who is here to record accurately what it is that you say during your comments. Whether you choose to speak today or not, you are invited to send us written comments. All comments, whether written or oral, are treated the same and have equal

weight. We will accept comments until mid-August and we will consider your comments that are submitted after that date to the extent that we can.

If you have any specific questions about the project itself, we have several representatives here from Minnesota Power, as well as a nice mapping GIS station so that you can look up specific properties or resources of interest and you can walk away with a map that's a nice visual aid to help you think about your comments maybe that you want to submit to us at a later time. And I encourage you to please utilize these resources while you're here.

And, with that, I'm going to turn this over -- oh, you're right, I always forget.

And here is the address of the federal website. We have both a state and federal. We have three websites, we have the PUC for the Public Utilities Commission proceeding and information docket, we also have the Department of Commerce website, which Bill Storm will be speaking about, and we've established the federal website.

You can comment to me directly or you can comment to Bill from the Minnesota Department of Commerce. You only have to comment to one of us -- you can comment to both, we don't discourage you

from commenting, but if you comment to one of us that will be captured collectively.

preparing this EIS jointly with the state so that we

And just to back up a little bit, we are

have a more efficient review process, as well as so that we reduce the amount of times that you have to submit comments and come to these informational and public hearings and meetings.

So with that said now, I'm going to turn it over to Dave Moeller from Minnesota Power to give you some background on the project itself.

MR. DAVID MOELLER: Good morning. My name is David Moeller, I'm an attorney at Minnesota Power based in Duluth, Minnesota.

When we've had hearings in northern or northwestern Minnesota, we introduced what Minnesota Power is, but folks here in Grand Rapids, in the Grand Rapids area know us well based on where we serve and our plants in the area so I'll skip that part.

We have many people here from Minnesota Power who can answer your questions, as Julie said, and we also have a GIS mapping station in the back that will be available afterwards, for not only getting maps for where your land is or property is,

but also if you need to look for different alternatives, we'd be happy to work with you on that.

For Minnesota Power the Great Northern
Transmission Line is part of a larger plan. We
filed it as part of our most recent integrated
resource plan approved by the Minnesota Public
Utilities Commission. And we see it as a way to
diversify our energy resources going forward by
adding additional hydro energy from Manitoba Hydro.

The need for this project is based really on three factors.

First, diversity. Providing access to clean, affordable, and reliable energy for Minnesota Power customers, as well as the region as a whole. This line will facilitate not just power and resources for Minnesota Power, but for the region as a whole.

Second, increasing demand. As people are well aware, we have increasing demand on the Iron Range, in particular, but for Minnesota Power's service territory. And as a utility in the area we have an obligation to serve and meet that demand.

And, finally, reliability. Having an additional 500 kV line will then strengthen the

2

system reliability for Minnesota Power and the region between Manitoba and Minnesota.

As we developed this project we had to

figure out what's the best way to have a siting and permitting strategy. And we did that through a number of steps. First charting what is the critical path, how do we get from A to B, what is the best way to do so. We had to reveal any fatal flaws that we encountered as we developed potential route options and other alternatives. Define what the study area is, the map that shows kind of where we started with the study area. We had to engage stakeholders multiple times. We were in Grand Rapids many times talking to landowners, local officials, planning officials, state and federal and local agencies and others as we developed this Determined what the range of alternatives is for routing and then, finally, apply for permits. On April 15th, 2014 we applied for both the state route permit as well as the federal presidential permit that we're here today to discuss.

2223

24

25

21

As we developed this project we had to look at both the opportunities and constraints. And I apologize for the small print on this slide, but the handout has it in more detail in the back. But

if you can see, there's many more constraints for where you can't build a transmission line or it's tougher to build a transmission line than opportunities, such as following existing transmission lines and other existing rights-of-way.

As we developed this process and the project we had to go through multiple stakeholder outreach, as I mentioned earlier. And I'll just flip through a few slides that show kind of where we had different meetings for stakeholder outreach and meeting with landowners and agencies. As you see, Grand Rapids was a constant throughout these.

And then, finally, we came to route alternatives that became part of our applications that we filed with the state and with the Department of Energy. And we had both a preferred and alternative routes as set out by state statute. The blue route is our preferred route and the orange route is our alternative route. Both, we think, would work from a feasibility standpoint, but we have a preference for the blue route.

As we developed this project, we also narrowed the scope. So starting from a study area of over 19,000 square miles, we've gone to corridors, route options, route alternatives, and

finally when the project is constructed, with our goal to start construction in 2016 to have it in service by 2020, we would have about eight square miles of project impact. This would come through the right-of-way, which is a 200-foot right-of-way for the transmission line for a 500 kV transmission line which would impact eight square miles.

This slide just shows the different workshops, open houses, and other meetings we've had, and then the different comments that we've received or the number of comments that we've received from landowners and stakeholders, including comments received online, all prior to when the official state and federal processes were kicked off.

We also were here in February, as Tracy mentioned, for a certificate of need scoping meeting for the environmental report. So we were here in February in a blizzard in Grand Rapids. So we've been out here for the official part of it and we'll be out here again in the future for future meetings and hearings.

So in addition to the state route permit and the federal presidential permit, we also need other major permits. This is a list of five of

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those, the five major permits. There will be other downstream permits as well, but the main ones are the state certificate of need which is issued by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. That process is still ongoing and we expect a decision by next May or so on that from the PUC. The state route permit from the PUC as well. The federal presidential permit from the DOE. The section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is for impacts to wetlands under the Clean Water Act. And then we'll need a permit from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to cross state lands, or a license from the DNR to cross state lands.

So, once again, we thank you for coming today, we look forward to hearing your comments.

And we have resources available to answer those either during the hearing itself or afterwards. And so we appreciate that and thanks again.

MR. BILL STORM: Thanks, Dave.

Good morning, folks. My name is Bill Storm. Many of you probably know me from previous projects in this area.

I work for the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce's role in this event or

activity that we're partaking in is we develop the scope of the environmental review and we produce the environmental review document. The Department of Commerce [sic], they're the ultimate decision-makers. And once we go through the scoping process, the release of the environmental document, the finalization of the environmental document, the public hearings, and the record gets presented before the Commission at the end, it's up to them to make a final decision.

And the decisions they are going to be making are, one, is the EIS adequate. That means does the EIS adequately address all the issues and concerns and alternatives that were brought up in scope and made it to the scoping decision. The second thing is they'll decide should a permit be granted for a high voltage transmission line to Minnesota Power and, if so, where should that line be situated and what conditions should be attached to that permit.

And I'm going to try not to move around 'cause I do that a lot.

But anyway, the schedule, this is basically the same schedule that Julie and Tracy went over and Dave touched on. It's basically just

a flow chart of the process. You can see we are right now at the public meeting stage, we're here to take your public comments, we're doing scoping as we speak this week.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In Minnesota, projects that are large transmission projects that come before the PUC for a determination on routing can go through two There are two processes available. 0ne processes. is the alternative process and the other one is the full process. Both processes have the same milestones and share some components. The full process is, for those projects that are large and complex, takes 12 months plus three to get through The alternative process is a shorter process, six months, it's for smaller projects, a lot less complex projects. But the projects all do share something. They all have a public scoping and comment period.

Basically, we come out, we provide information about the process and the project to the public and we scope the environmental document.

What do you guys want to see in the environmental document.

Following the public scoping meeting and the public comment period, a scoping decision is

rendered. The scoping decision is the authority of the Department of Commerce commissioner. And what I will do is, once we end the road show, we were on the northern track last week, this week we're doing sort of the southern track, collecting people's input, getting your issues, your concerns, your alternatives on the table, once the comment period closes, which is August 15th, and I'll discuss that a little later, I will make a recommendation to my commissioner of what should be in the scope.

And the scope is basically a table of contents, what is the EIS, what issues, concerns, and alternatives is the EIS going to evaluate. That scoping decision comes out of the Department of Commerce. My commissioner will then release the scoping decision and the next step is the environmental review document.

In the full process, the environmental review document is an EIS. In the shorter alternative process it's called an EA, an environmental assessment. A little less scope, little shorter document, a little less process to that. But here in the full process we will be putting out an environmental impact statement. And the environmental impact statement comes out in a

draft first. So we release a draft environmental impact statement. Once that's released we will come back up for another two-week road show and have public meetings to get your comments on the draft environmental impact statement, what do you think of the document, are there things you think I've missed, are there things you think I didn't flesh out enough. This is your opportunity to put information into the record again concerning that environmental review document that we generated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Once the comment period closes that's associated with DEIS meetings, we will then begin work on the final EIS. And the final EIS is basically the draft EIS issued with an additional volume. That volume lists every comment we got on the draft EIS and our responses to those comments. And our responses may range from just a simple acknowledgment of, yes, thank you for your comment, or it may be, well, that's a good point you brought up, that's good information you provided us, based on your information we revised certain sections of the draft EIS. And it'll point you back to those sections and you will be able to go back to those sections and you'll see bold, underlined, and strikeouts for what was there and what the new

revised language is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

While we're working on the final EIS, there is also a public hearing. And as Tracy said, we'll be back up here with an ALJ, administrative law judge, to take your comments on the record as a whole. What conditions do you want to see in the permit, what comments do you have to make about any aspects of the project.

Like I said, the purpose that I'm here for tonight is for the scoping meeting. The scoping meeting is to provide the public an opportunity to participate. I'm looking for your input on issues. And there's two ways you can do that. One is you can suggest alternative routes or alternative route segments that you want me to consider for the scoping decision. If they make it into the scoping decision, then they will be evaluated in the environmental document and proceed through the hearing and into the final decision. The second is I'm looking for issues or concerns you may have. I'm looking for local knowledge. You guys may be familiar with this route from hunting, hiking, mountain biking along the routes, or within the area that we're looking at, and you may be familiar with maybe there's an old cedar stand that you know the

deer use for wintering that you're concerned about and you want to make sure that my EIS discusses that and talks about the impact that the project may have on that area of concern and what ways can we mitigate that impact.

By rule, when my commissioner releases a scoping decision, it's got to have three things in it. One is it's got to identify all the routes, you know, the ones that the applicant's proposing, plus any ones that the citizens have brought up and made it through scope. It has to specify what impacts are going to be addressed and what are the mitigations to those impacts. And it also has to provide a schedule, when do we think the document will be released.

Julie touched on this a little bit.

Basically a definition of an environmental impact statement, a written document that describes human and environmental impacts associated with the transmission project and any alternatives that made it through scope and methods to mitigate them. So that's basically the goal of this document.

As I said, there are -- the reason I'm here tonight is to, since it's my responsibility to scope the environmental document, it's my

responsibility to assist or aid in the preparation of the environmental document, I'm coming to you to ask you, give me your local knowledge of the issues, concerns, that you want to make sure that I cover in the document. And in preparation for that I always do a draft scoping document. This is on the table in the front, if you picked it up. It explains a little bit about what environmental review is and it also gives you, on page 5 and 6, I do believe, yep, it also gives you an example of what the table of contents of an environmental impact statement should look like.

And this is broad categories. You can see that, as I list the broad categories out, what I'm seeking from you folks is help me define these categories better, fill these categories in better. And when it comes to issues, this is an example that I'm talking about, if you look at this draft document, you can see at 5.13, natural environment. That's a broad category. Under that there are several other categories that are also broad. Flora, plants, that's a broad category. And as I said, you may be aware with your local knowledge that there's a particular plant, say the Lapland buttercup that you know is there because you've been

mountain biking through this route, proposed route area, you're concerned about it, you want to make sure that I address in my environmental impact statement, what's the potential impact that this line is going to have on that plant that I'm interested in. And what ways can be used to mitigate that impact during construction, best management practices, working on frozen ground, not in the spring. How they use lay down areas, how they control erosion. All that could have an effect on this Lapland buttercup and this is your opportunity to say I want to make sure you cover that, Bill.

Now, there may be -- you may have knowledge of an issue or a concern that you don't think can be managed through construction best practices or design of the line within the route that has been proposed. So you may think, well, the only way I think you can protect this, Bill, my interest, whatever that thing may be, is moving the route. And that's where we get into alternative route segments.

And you can see, if you look at the draft scoping document that I have on the table, one of the categories, section 4, alternative routes.

Joe's property, that's not going to carry the same amount of weight as, hey, Bill, I know there's an old stand of cedars in there and I know the deer winter in there, and it's one of the few areas that they can get away and get some protection. To me, that's a higher concern than I don't want to live with the transmission line. And I understand how people feel about that and I understand how high this bar is.

If you look at the rules, the rules state how is the public to put alternatives on the route, Bill? If you want to put an alternative on the route you have to do two things. You have to explain to me why you want that alternative on the

So this is your opportunity to give me

alternative routes if you think there's an issue or

an item that you have that you think the only way to

route or route segment. And when I talk about this,

as you guys submit these route alternatives to me, I

avoid impacting that issue or concern is actually

moving the route, coming up with an alternative

recommendation to the commissioner. And if your

rationale for wanting the route segment moved is I

just don't want it on my property, let's move it to

have to sort of weigh them in making my

route, and in that explanation tell me what it is you're mitigating. And if the impact that you're worried about is I just don't want it on my property, or I don't want to look at it, put it on Joe's property, you haven't mitigated the situation, you've just moved it to Joe. So that won't carry as much weight as like the deer wintering stand that I talked about.

The other thing you have to do is provide me all the supporting information. Maps, your rationale for why you want the alternative to be considered. And because that's such a high bar -- and now I'm going to move, I'm sorry, Janet, so try to stick with me.

Because of such a large high bar, I like to run through some examples that have come up in the past and that I've used in the past.

This here is a transmission line that was proposed by an applicant running between Tower and Embarrass in Minnesota, of course. And the original proposal from the utility was they wanted to run this new 115 kV line up the east side of this road, 135. There were a series of landowners along this section up here of the road who realized that the transmission line, the way it was proposed, was

going to run between their homes and the road.

They're set back 75, 100 feet, whatever the distance that people are willing to plow up here, so they're set back. They were uncomfortable with the line running between their homes and the road, but they had local knowledge that a whole block of land behind them was all tax-forfeited land, it was public land now. And they came to me and they said, Bill, we think it's rational that, when available, that the Commission consider putting the transmission line, rather than putting it on private land, move it over to this readily available public land.

That made sense to me. I recommended that to my commissioner, that that go into the scope of the environmental document, it did go into the scope of the environmental document, therefore it was carried through to the environmental document that was generated and considered, it was carried through then to the public hearing and it finally was carried through to the final decision in front of the PUC.

And when the PUC looked at all the record, not only just the environmental assessment, but they also looked at the statements and the

testimony that came in through the public hearing, they agreed. They thought, yes, that does make sense, that we should move this line to public property because it's readily available, rather than going through the public property. So that's one example.

Next example. This is in Chaska down in the Twin Cities. This is a rebuild of a 69 kV line. The utility wanted to rebuild an existing 69 kV line that ran along that mall of that purple line there. And there was some citizens in the community who were concerned about a historic property that was located right here. They felt that upgrading from a 69 kV line to a 115 kV line, which would have taller poles, a wider right-of-way, a little bit more capacity on the line, they felt that there was a possibility that that would negatively impact that historic feature of this historic property.

So they came to me and said, look, Bill, we'd like you to consider in your scoping document two things, two alternatives. One was an alternative route segment, and it was defined as an alternative route segment because it actually left the route. The utility wanted to rebuild along the existing right-of-way, but they also came in with a

that line out of the route, down to this abandoned railroad track, and then run it along that until it hooks back up to the existing line. The second alternative they wanted me to look at is not a route alternative, but an alignment alternative. They said we see where the company wants an alignment, an anticipated alignment, which is right along where the 69 line is. They said how about if we just push it across the road and look at that to hopefully prevent this historic building from being possibly potentially impacted.

That made sense to me. I recommended it

route, a 500-foot-wide route. The first option that

these citizens wanted me to look at was, let's pull

That made sense to me. I recommended it to my commissioner for the scope, it made it into the scope, therefore it was evaluated in the environmental document, made it through the public hearings, and then at the end was laid -- the whole record was laid out in front of the Commission, the EA being a portion of that, the public record, everything.

When they considered the whole record, the Commission felt that the impact to the historic building was not significant. They didn't feel that this rebuild would be significant, so when they

permitted the line they permitted it the way the utility requested, right along the rebuild of the 69 line.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next example. This is, I think, near Floodwood. The utility wanted to build a 115 transmission line and they wanted to run up the west side of this road and then turn and run along the south side of this county road. The citizens in the area who lived along this county road, and this goes out far, this is just a little section of it so it's a significant run. They had their homes along the road, just like many do, when you're set back from the road enough distance that you can stand to plow, I guess, in the winter. They had some local knowledge and they knew all the land along this whole stretch up here was corporate land, Blandin Paper land, some other corporate land that was used for the paper industry, the pulp industry. No homes along it, nobody living on it, just resource land.

They came to me and said, look, Bill, we think it makes sense to, rather than building this transmission across our driveways by our homes, can we move it to the north side of that line? Can you look at the impacts or can that make it to scope so you can look at the impacts of moving that line?

That made sense to me. I recommended it to my commissioner, my commissioner agreed, it made it to the scope. Since it made it to scope it was evaluated in the environmental document, went through the public hearing,.

And then at the end when the whole record was laid out in front of the Commissioners, the EA plus all the testimony and everything else that comes out in public hearing, the Commissioners agreed that that made sense and when they issued the permit they required that the utility build that transmission line along the north side of that road.

Another example. This is, I think, again near the Floodwood area. This is a rebuild of a 69 kV line. There's a 69 kV line that ran along the west side of this road here. The utility wanted to rebuild it to 115. Again, that required taller towers, a little wider right-of-way, more capacity on the line. There was a local property owner family here who had a memorial service, or memorial placement just outside the existing right-of-way of that 69 line. And they were concerned that the widening of the route, the taller poles, maybe a little more tree clearing that would be required, they were afraid that that would have a negative

impact on their family's memorial. They came to me
and asked me if I would consider it.

That made sense to me, it was worth looking at and considering, so I recommended to my commissioner that we look at putting the transmission line on the other side of the road. It made it into the scoping decision, was evaluated in the EA, went to the public hearing,.

And then again at the end when the whole record was laid in front of the Commission, the Commission considered it, and when they looked at the environmental report that laid out photographic renderings of what it would look like from the memorial, the distances that the memorial existed from the existing line to the new line, all the measurements, all the facts, the Commission felt that that memorial would not be significantly impacted. So when they granted the permit, they granted it for what the utility requested, to run along the west side of that road there.

Another example. This is in the Glencoe/Waconia area. This is another rebuild. There was a 69 kV line that ran east-west along County Road 34. Right here. The utility wanted to upgrade that to a 115. Again, little taller towers,

a little wider right-of-way, more capacity on the line. But from the time that the 69 line was built to a couple years ago when we got around -- when this project came to surface, the county had moved the County Road 34. County Road 34 used to follow this existing 69 line, or vice versa, along there. Somewhere after that transmission line was built, they moved the county road up. The landowners who lived along this section came to me and said, well, look, Bill, if they are going to have to tear down and rebuild that line, why not readjust it and realign it to the existing right-of-way of the county road like it was before originally.

That made sense to me. I recommended that to my commissioner -- excuse me -- my commissioner agreed, put it in the scope. Since it was in the scope it got evaluated in the environmental assessment, went to the public hearing, and then was laid out again in front of the Commission with all the facts.

And the Commissioners agreed that, yes, that makes sense. When they issued the permit they required the utility to realign the transmission line with the county road that had been moved.

So that's some examples of what I'm

looking for, and you guys helping me scope out what possible alternatives I could look at in the environmental document. And we can certainly talk more about that when we get to the question and answering portion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This slide here is to just show you that I don't work in isolation. That the downstream permitting agencies that both -- that Dave referred The DOT, if the line is going to cross a DOT jurisdiction road they need a permit from the DOT. The DNR, if they're going to cross public lands or waters they need a permit from the DNR. They may need a permit from the Pollution Control Agency for erosion control measures, that type of thing. of these agencies are required by statute and rule to participate in the program. So I'm not working in isolation, I'm seeking out information from the experts in the various fields. In addition, in this case, as Julie said, since we're doing a joint environmental document, we are also working with the DOE, so we have another group of folks helping us out.

Downstream permits. Dave already covered that a little bit. Once they get our permit, that's not the go sign, they still have to get other

permits down the line before they can construct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Information. As Tracy said and Jules said, and I'm sure Dave, too, we all have ways for you to track this project. Maybe too many ways. But you can go to the PUC's website, which is eDockets. I look at eDockets as a professional It's where the official record is kept and site. there's a lot of information there. The applicant also, they also maintain a website for the citizens to go get information on. The DOE maintains a website. And the Department of Commerce maintains a And what I do with our website is any website. documents, public comments, the draft scoping decision, the real scoping decision, all these documents, I PDF them, put them on our website, you can download them, print them out, and view them. So that's just another -- there are many avenues on the Great Northern Transmission Line for you to get information.

And, like I said, what we're here tonight to do is get input from the public. That's what we're doing. And there's a comment period that's open for you to either give me issues, concerns, or alternatives. That comment period is open until August 15th. There's a little juxtaposition in

their comment period, they have the 12th, we're falling back to the longest period, which is the 15th. So you can get your comments to me snail mail, e-mail, fax. You can go to my website and make a comment there. You can put your comments in the way Julie told you to give them. You can comment to us both if you want, but you only have to comment to one of us, we are sharing the information, we are working on the project directly. But your comments do have to be in by August 15th.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to the important part. You noticed when you came in, we have these yellow cards. I always bring a stack of yellow cards for speakers, it helps move things along, especially if I -- sometimes I have four, three hundred people at these meetings, it helps. The turnout is a little lighter here.

But what I'll do is I'll call them from the cards. When I call your name, stand up, Julie will come to you with the mic. I want you to state and spell your name for the court reporter. Talk slower than me so she can follow you. And then ask your question, make your comment, say your piece. If you have a question, I will try to direct that question to -- if it can reasonably be answered,

I'll try to direct that question either to the applicant, to the PUC staff, to the DOE staff, or myself to answer your question, to try the best we can to answer your question. Some of your questions might be more complex and need a little bit more time to get back. And we have a court reporter here, we will make sure that your comment gets captured and it gets answered along the way as we move through the scoping process.

So I'm going to start. Carol Overland.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Thank you. I get to
be first this time.

My name is Carol Overland. Is this on? It is, okay.

I am an attorney, I'm representing residents and ratepayers against the Not-So-Great Northern Transmission Line. That's another site where you can get information about this. Google Great Northern Transmission Line, and the second one down will be the Not-So-Great Northern Transmission Line site. What I do there is keep people apprised of what's going on.

It's very important, I'm really glad to see the DOE involved in this. Because those of us who went through the environmental review process

for the Mesaba project know how important that is, and a lot of problems were pointed out with that. The DOE helped push this to get a very thorough review. And so I urge you to make your comments, especially very specific ones.

Like, in particular, some people are getting hit by many, many projects going over their lands. A pipeline, then a transmission line, then this big, huge transmission line. You know, that is a really significant problem and take a look -- ask them to take a look at cumulative impacts of this line, plus whatever else might be there already. That's a really important thing to take a look at when you're looking at routing.

Another thing that's really important is that this is a segmented project. This is just the Minnesota part. There is the Manitoba part, there's the Wisconsin part, there's the part going up and over the UP and then down to Detroit. This is for regional sales going out through Minnesota to somewhere else, primarily. That's the purpose of it. So they need to take a look at that, because under NEPA, which is federal environmental review law, you have to look at the entire project.

Segmenting is not okay. So take a look at that.

are all these houses and you could build here instead of there.

But also in the federal process they will be looking at need. And this is a line that isn't needed. They say that it's for a power purchase agreement, and that's about this big, but the line is gigantic. It's huge. Way overdesigned for what their stated purpose is. So have them take a look

So I urge you to make your comments in

writing, as many ways as you possibly can. A good

particular piece of property, to have them print out

way to do it is if you have issues about your

a map, they're really good at that, and they'll

locate your property and then you can write in on

that any comments that you have about, well, we've

got this, we've got this, you don't know about this

'cause you haven't been on our land, you don't know

about this. Or you have this stretch where there

When you look at what the potential capacity is of this line, the EMF impacts need to be addressed, that you need to look at what the full potential range of EMF impacts are. You know, that won't happen unless you really push for it. So I urge you to really push for that, fill out your

at that and look at it.

comments --

Oh, another thing. Eagle take permits, does this need eagle take permits? How many eagles will be killed, how many birds protected by, you know, federal law could be killed by this. Other transmission projects that I've worked on have required eagle take permits, so that's something to take a look at and that Bill will have to look at.

So, please, send your comments in. And for another view of this, check out the maps of the not-so-great-northern-transmission-line.org, and you can shoot me an e-mail and I can add you to a list where I send out notices on when comments are due and when there are meetings and such.

Thank you. I appreciate the advertising time.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Carol. Okay. Rich Libbey.

MR. RICHARD LIBBEY: I'm Rich Libbey, 18603 Lake Drive, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

I'd just like to start on that this is a very major power line, it has towers that could be 140 feet high, the right-of-way is going to be 200 feet wide. And as proposed, at least Itasca County, it does not really follow any existing transmission

lines. In fact, over the entire route, the orange route would follow 30 percent of existing transmission lines over the 220-mile corridor, and the blue route would be about 38 percent. I'd like to see that upped, if possible, because when you cut a new power line across country like in Itasca County, you're going to impact a lot of virgin territory. Whereas, if you follow an existing route, you basically just move the side perimeter over 200 feet.

With the proposed route you're going to have an edge effect, which -- and the environment is not beneficial. If you cut a path through, it opens up a pathway for invasive species. It also creates an edge effect, which it can impact migratory song birds. Cowbirds and non-native type birds can move along that corridor. They prefer the edges, and it can affect the wildlife.

So one thing I would like to see is that where the line comes down north of Bigfork, there's an existing 230 kV line and a 500 kV line in existence that follows just on the west side of Highway 65 north of Nashwauk. The proposed route is a new path between the Scenic Highway and Highway 65. If they were to follow this route, you'd avoid

all these other negative impacts. And it would increase the length of the route somewhat, but when you have a 220-mile route, you increase the length maybe five miles, that would not be significant.

One issue that Minnesota Power has pointed out is that if you have too many large voltage power lines paralleling each other, in the case of a wind event or an ice event or a tornado, that all the lines could be taken down at once. Their proposal is to have the new line about five miles west of the existing corridor. With the type of storm events we get up here, tornadoes are very unusual, we do get straight line winds, and we get ice events. A straight line wind event and an ice event would very likely take out all the lines anyway, or could. And as part of the mitigation, if you follow the existing route there are ways you can strengthen the structures when you build them so they're not so susceptible.

Also, they are doing a study right now, that the federal government is doing, or maybe it's MISO, Midwest Independent System Operators, or is it FERC, maybe it's FERC. They're studying what the likelihood is of the line being taken down by a storm event in a certain number of years. The

1 results
2 be impor

results aren't released yet, but I think that would be important in considering this alternative route. And, also, where the other lines go is important.

The 500 kV line that's owned by Xcel Energy, goes to southern Minnesota and serves a different load than Minnesota Power does. The 350 kV line goes to Shannon Sub, which is in Minnesota Power's territory, but if all the lines are taken down I think the study should verify what impact it will or will not have on the system. If those impacts are so great that that's not a good route, so be it. But we know what the impacts are going to be to build a new line across country and across Itasca County.

I guess another question I have, I'll maybe come back to Itasca County, but the line starts west of Warroad, and if you look at -- I guess Minnesota Power really didn't provide a map with the existing transmission lines on it. If you go to their website all you'll see is where the route corridor goes. But nowhere do they have a map that shows where the existing transmission lines are.

I requested it from them at several meetings, and their response was that it would

confuse the public to see where their existing lines 2 are because there are too many lines on the map.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When they filed their route application, I looked in there to see if they had existing lines on a map, which they didn't. And after I put in a request for it on the completeness of the document, they didn't include such a map. But I have some available here if anybody is interested.

But going back to the crossing of the border, there are two lines that come across now, the 230 and the 350 and the 500 kV line, and Minnesota Power is entering to the west of that, where I understand there's some issues with an airport clearances of that line, so they're talking about moving it east.

We don't know what's going on, at least here in Minnesota on the northern part of the border, why Canada says, okay, we're going to stop here; Minnesota, you pick up here. Can we go back to them and say we're going to start here, you come But I'm wondering what the constraints are to us? on the other side of the border that they're not following the existing routes. That's another suggestion I have.

When it comes to building the line

itself, you know, just when it comes to environmental impacts, forest fragmentation, impacts 2 on rare plants, like Bill said, deer yards. 3 4 provide some written comments later, but you also 5 have species like the goshawk. I know the federal government, the National Forest Service, they go out 6 7 and do goshawk surveys. They count the goshawks and document where the nests are. 8

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On this route, I think, what is it, 40 percent or something or 50 percent is going to cross state land and 12 percent county land. But I would suggest that you do surveys for goshawks because the goshawks tend to be in old groves, contiguous forests, and if you cut up a new swath you're opening it up and modifying the environment.

I think what else I had, I had a lot of stuff written down, but through Itasca County, basically, there is another line, it's a 69 kV line that comes down from Bigfork on the west side of Highway 38, that I think maybe we could do -- at least explore that possibility. I'm hoping that we can look at the paralleling existing lines as the primary alternative.

> Can I take a break, Bill --MR. BILL STORM: Sure, you can come back.

MR. RICHARD LIBBEY: -- and come back in a little bit?

Oh, on the middle segment there, we've got a C-1 alternative, I think, that goes around Littlefork, Little Falls, because there's an issue with the airport. And I'm just wondering if there's a way to shorten the length of the new angle that goes across there. Right now it kind of goes through quite a bit of new territory as it comes down.

And, also, the preferred route for Minnesota Power, as I understand, would have been to follow the existing, I think, it's a 500 kV line that comes down that goes down by east of Red Lake. But there's two scientific and natural areas in there, the Red Lake Peatland and the Lost Lake Peatland. There's a statuary law, but there's a Minnesota statute that you can't build in an existing SNA. There is already a line there, so I guess one thing to look at is the environmental effects of going on the orange and blue routes that are proposed, or if there's some waiver they could get to widen that line and parallel it. I know the DNR and Minnesota Power have been discussing that. But just another option that's out there.

Thanks. 1 2 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Richard. That was a lot of stuff there, Richard. 3 4 Minnesota Power, do you want any comment 5 on that? You don't have to. MR. JIM ATKINSON: There was a lot of 6 7 things that were covered. MR. BILL STORM: Okay, that's fine. 8 9 That was all the cards I have, so my 10 default position is to go by a show of hands. And, again, here we go. 11 12 Anybody, did that jog anybody, anybody 13 want to ask a question, make a comment? 14 Okay, sir. Would you please stand up and 15 let Julie bring you the mic, and state and spell 16 your name? MR. CAVOUR JOHNSON: Cavour Johnson. 17 18 C-A-V-O-U-R, first name. Johnson, the last name. 19 If what I'm saying is inappropriate, cut 20 me off if it isn't going to help. But I just wanted 21 to go through the history of part of the routing up 22 by Hartley Lake and Scooty Lake and Wolf Lake. The original routes were close to both 23 Scooty and Hartley Lake, the eastern shore. 24 25 alternative route is the same way on both lakes. We

met with Jim Atkinson of Minnesota Power to see if those could be changed. At the time of their submission they weren't able to change that and they suggested getting -- if we wanted to do something, getting together on all three lakes and coming up with a petition for a route.

And we kind of pursued that route and I was in charge of Hartley Lake. The Hartley Lake Association voted to move the line further east. And the other lakes, Scooty Lake and Wolf Lake, do not have associations, so I contacted as many people as I could on those lakes as far as interest in a petition to move both routes further east, away from the lakes. I was only able to reach about 70 to 75 percent of the residents on those lakes, and they were in favor of that, moving the line and signed a petition.

But in the meantime, Minnesota Power had to reintroduce or re-present their routing and they were able to change the route to what we preferred. So those areas that they have in that area are, I mean, although individuals would probably prefer to see it in a different county or whatever, those routes we prefer to what they had originally. And I'm just stating that so that you're aware that if

closer to the lakes in those areas. 2 Thank you. 3 4 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you. 5 Okay. Show of hands? Comments? Questions? 6 7 Sir, in the back, please stand, state and spell your name. 8 MR. BOB NICK: Can you hear me? Is the 9 10 mic on? 11 MR. BILL STORM: You've got to keep the 12 mic real close to your mouth. 13 MR. BOB NICK: This gentleman here had 14 his back to us. 15 Anyway, the power lines are coming down here on county land. Is the power company going to 16 17 buy that land from the county or are they going to 18 rent it? We'd have ongoing income from the rental 19 that way, not buying it. 20 Secondly, the road where that's going to 21 come down, under the power line, I assume, which 22 it's going to be, right? To take and with the 23 concrete and the steel and everything else that goes 24 into those lines. Is that road going to be 25 maintained? Or is it just a one-time deal and you

there's changes from that, we do not want them

1

abandon it? If it's going to be maintained, what kind of things have you done to take and keep it from being abused by snowmobilers or ATVers. You drive along the interstate and 169, it's nothing but a trash heap. You've seen the property bags that is picked up by the Boy Scouts or whatever.

And what is the timeline to be completed on this power line? And, secondly, what cost? And are you going to hire any local labor? These issues have not been addressed.

This is all wonderful, Bill, to have all this stuff here with all the permits, but I don't think anybody cares about the permits. It's how they're going to affect me, you know. And if somebody gets hurt on this property, is it the power line's problem or is it the county's problem if it's county land? Suing is a national pastime, not baseball anymore.

MR. BILL STORM: If you'll take a breath, I'll ask Minnesota Power.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: I can address a couple of them, anyway.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. We'll let

Minnesota Power catch a couple of your points there.

We will certainly try to capture when we go through

1 scope, the scoping document of all the comments, we'll try to answer some of these questions that 2 we're missing, but let's give Minnesota Power an 3 4 opportunity to hit some of the bullets that you hit. MR. JIM ATKINSON: Jim Atkinson with 5 Minnesota Power. 6 7 UNIDENTIFIED: You earned your dinner 8 tonight. DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: We need your name. 9 10 MR. BOB NICK: Oh, Nick, over by Twin 11 Lakes. Bob Nick, N-I-C-K. 12 COURT REPORTER: Nick? MR. BOB NICK: Yes, it is. That's the 13 14 look you're giving me, like, oh. 15 MR. BILL STORM: Let's give Jim a chance 16 to answer the question. 17 MR. BOB NICK: Okav. Please. 18 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Again, Jim Atkinson 19 with Minnesota Power. 20 One of the questions had to do with 21 county land and where we cross that. The answer is 22 that if it's truly county fee land, it might 23 actually be a permanent easement we'd have to pay 24 If it's state land we'll actually have to get for. 25 a license and we'll have to pay a fee for that as

well.

As far as access roads, in most cases there will not be any permanent access road. A lot of this goes through the woods, through wetland areas as well, and there's likely to be a temporary timber mat road through along the whole thing. But that will be removed immediately upon completion of construction.

I think you asked the question about when would this be done. Our required in-service date with our power purchase agreement is June 1st of 2020, so sometime before that, and not likely very long before that.

 $\label{eq:controller} If \ there \ was \ other \ questions, \ I \ don't$ know if I remember all of them.

MR. DAVID MOELLER: Labor and compensation.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: Oh, yeah. Labor, there will be some local labor involved. There will be specialty construction companies from other areas that would have to be hired as well. So it would be a combination of those two things.

There will be a significant property tax impact as a result of the line, likely in the vicinity of about \$17 to \$19 million a year in new

1 property taxes. Does that answer some of your questions? 2 The \$19 million you just 3 MR. BOB NICK: 4 mentioned, is that going to be on our tax bill or 5 yours? MR. JIM ATKINSON: Ours. 6 7 MR. BOB NICK: Okay. Now, since this line is coming through the northern part of the 8 state, maybe the legislature will address it that 9 10 since our property is impacted, why does not that 11 come to this area of the state versus the south? 12 MR. JIM ATKINSON: It does. 13 MR. BOB NICK: It does. So these are the 14 things you guys can be addressing and you're not 15 telling anybody. 16 MR. JIM ATKINSON: We do bring that up every time we have an open house and so forth, so we 17 18 do address that. 19 MR. BOB NICK: Yeah. Well, okay. Ι 20 appreciate it. 21 Thank you. Have a good day. 22 MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Sir, I would 23 ask -- I'd encourage you to put your comments in

writing again to me by August 15th. Just write your

comments out as bullet points. And we'll make sure

24

25

1 when we do the scoping document we will answer as 2 many of those questions as we can. We will get that 3 answer to you. 4 Delores. Could you please come Okay. 5 forward with the mic, face the court reporter. I'm State and spell your name. 6 sorry. 7 MS. DELORES WHITE: My name is Delores White, D-E-L-O-R-E-S, White. I live in Bovey. 8 The question I have, I read somewhere 9 10 that Minnesota Power was not going to share any 11 existing corridors. Is that -- I read that in one 12 of the mailings I got. 13 MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Jim, do you want 14 to answer that? 15 MR. JIM ATKINSON: I sure would. Jim 16 Atkinson again with Minnesota Power. 17 The answer to the question is we're 18 trying to collocate with as many existing corridors So but there's various reasons in some 19 as we can. 20 circumstances why we can't or choose not to. 21 MS. DELORES WHITE: Okay. 22 MR. BILL STORM: Anything else? 23 MS. DELORES WHITE: No, just to comment 24 that I'm unhappy about the line coming through my Because the trees are pretty old, they've 25 property.

been there since I was a child and I'm in my 60s now, and so I hate to see that happen to my property. And it seems like everybody wants to come through. That just upsets me, that's all.

MR. BILL STORM: I understand. Thank you, Delores.

Is there someone else? Please come forward, Linda, and make your comment, state and spell your name, face the court reporter. The acoustics in this room aren't so great for the court reporter. Keep the mic close to your mouth, too, that mic doesn't pick up too well.

MS. LINDA CASTAGNERI: My name is Linda Castagneri, L-I-N-D-A, C-A-S, as in Sam, T-A-G-N-E-R-I.

I just have a couple of -- one question and one comment. Initially I was on the notification list from Minnesota Power. Then you all sent me a letter saying I was no longer in the impacted area. When I came in today, Gerry was very nice, he assisted me back there, and I am now 1,200 feet from one edge of the corridor and 1,900 feet from the other edge of the corridor.

So I'd like you to all tell me, what is your criteria for notification? 'Cause I still

think I'm pretty close to being taken off the list.That's my first comment.

And my second comment regards the cumulative impact of every project. We have been living the project of the year since 2005. Whether it was Minnesota -- the Mesaba project, or this project. And I do really think it does bear some merit for it to be looked at, this continuing cumulative impact of every project.

So thank you.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Linda.

One comment I want to make for Linda.

There is an official project list that the state and the DOE use, and if you're not on that list or you don't think you're on that list, please fill out an orange card and give it to Tracy to make sure you're on that official list.

Now, Minnesota Power may maintain their own list for their own purposes, but our list, anybody who is interested in getting any kind of notification of the documents that are produced, of meetings coming up, anything, please make sure you're on our list, okay.

Okay. Show of hands?

Gentleman, please come forward, state and

spell your name, face the court reporter as much as you can. Thank you.

MR. MARK WALSH: Mark Walsh, W-A-L-S-H.

I've got a couple of concerns. First would be, I guess it goes right back to the basics of it, is why do we need this line? Or is it just economics? Is it someone looking to make money?

MR. BILL STORM: Well, there is -- in Minnesota, if a utility wants to build a large energy project, whether it be a transmission line or a power plant, there are two things they may need from the Commission. The first thing is a certificate of need. And that is where they have to make their case to the Commission about why they need the power and why they need it in the form of a transmission line versus generation or vice versa. So they have to get that approval from the PUC before they can get the approval for a route or a construction for a power plant.

As you know, I was up here in the winter doing the same thing, 'cause as Tracy pointed out, there is a separate docket on the need. And the need and the routing, although it might not seem quite right, they can run concurrently. The two processes can run concurrently. However, the

applicant must get approval for the certificate of need before they can get approval for a route. And by running them concurrently, which the rules allow them to run, they are taking the chance that all the effort they're putting in on the routing side now may be for naught if they fail to prove their case for the need. But the system does -- the rules do allow the processes to run concurrently. It's just -- I guess it's to save time and to help the business community in having some consistency and some anticipated schedule. But they are taking the risk then, because if they fail to get their need certificate, all the effort for the routing will be moot. So --

MR. MARK WALSH: So the need has not been established, then?

MR. BILL STORM: No. The process is running right now. I put out -- about two weeks ago I put out the environmental document relative to that process, and that document looked at what are the impacts of this proposed project from a high elevation, size, type, and timing situation. A very high elevation look. So basically the environmental review around the need is basically, if the utility comes with a transmission project like this one, how

about -- what's the impact of that transmission project compared to if we built a power plant right here. So that's what the need is all about. The need process is about the form of the power, the size, type, and timing of the power.

The routing process is where the rubber meets the road. If they are successful in the need and the Public Utilities Commission does agree that, yes, you have the need and, yes, transmission is the answer, this process, the routing process, is where we evaluate that. What are the impacts on the ground of actually building this thing.

MR. MARK WALSH: Okay. So in the need process they would have to explain where that power will be used or why it's needed?

MR. BILL STORM: They have to state the purpose and need, yes, for sure.

MR. MARK WALSH: Okay. But we don't know what that is yet?

MR. BILL STORM: No, they stated it in their application and it's covered in the ER, the environmental document for the need. If you guys want to give a short synopsis on it, you can. If you don't, you don't have to.

MR. MARK WALSH: They can, okay, in a

1 moment then, all right. So just a couple of other items I want to 2 3 cover. 4 Next, when you talk about environmental 5 studies, now there's an EA or a full assessment, right? You touched on both of those and I just 6 wanted to make sure that there's a full assessment 7 8 going to be done. MR. BILL STORM: 9 In Minnesota there are 10 two ways that a permit application, a routing permit 11 can be --MR. MARK WALSH: 12 Yes. 13 MR. BILL STORM: -- the full and the 14 alternative. 15 MR. MARK WALSH: Yes. 16 MR. BILL STORM: This, because of the 17 size of it -- and they have thresholds in the rules. 18 If you're this many kilovolts and this long, you 19 can't be the short process, you have to be the long 20 process. So they're in the full process. The full 21 process requires an environmental impact statement. 22 The short process requires an EA.

MR. MARK WALSH: An assessment, yeah.

It's the process that surrounds the

MR. BILL STORM: The documents are pretty

23

24

25

similar.

documents may be a little different. The EIS is first released as a draft and then it's followed up by public meetings. We come around and we ask you, the people, what did we do wrong with this document, or what do you want to see in this document. And we take all that information and we generate a final EIS.

On the short process, the alternative process, in the EA, the environmental assessment, it's an environmental review document, but it's only released one time as a final document. There is no second bite of the apple, like you say. Now, the public can talk about it in the public hearing, both processes at the public hearing, so --

MR. MARK WALSH: Okay. So it's the full study, though.

MR. BILL STORM: It's the full study.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And if I may address from the federal side, from the National Environmental Policy Act, there are also choices in terms of, you know, the robustness of the process. And as I pointed out in my talk, the federal government has determined that we need to go through our most robust process, which is also the environmental impact statement.

1 MR. MARK WALSH: Very good. Very good. Another item I just wanted to touch on. 2 I'm not a real power line type of guy. When you 3 4 talk about a little bit taller than the existing 5 power lines out there, what are we talking about actual height wise? I mean, you know. And are 6 7 there lights on these towers? MR. BILL STORM: Well, there are no 8 9 lights on the towers, but I'll let --10 MR. MARK WALSH: So they're not tall 11 enough to have lights on them? 12 MR. BILL STORM: Let's take a breath and 13 let Jim -- you had two points, do you remember the 14 first point? 15 MR. JIM ATKINSON: The first one was 16 about need, I think that's best for the need docket. 17 I can talk about the towers. The tower structures 18 would be a maximum height of 150 feet tall, which is 19 considerably taller than most transmission lines. 20 MR. MARK WALSH: What are they now? 21 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Which ones? 22 MR. MARK WALSH: See, a 500 kV, you know, I'm talking about 120 volts to plug in my lights, 23 24 you know. 25 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Most 500 kV lines

1 would have similar height structures. 2 MR. MARK WALSH: Okay. But say the ones that run now, with the three lines that hang from 3 4 them. 5 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Well, those are various voltages, but those are likely somewhere 6 between 75 to 100, may 110 feet tall. 7 MR. MARK WALSH: 8 So these are 9 considerably taller, then? 10 MR. JIM ATKINSON: They are, yes. 11 MR. MARK WALSH: And they're not tall 12 enough to where they need to have some type of light 13 on them at night for flights or planes or skydivers 14 or whatever? 15 MR. JIM ATKINSON: That's correct. Yeah. 16 so we don't anticipate lights on any of them. 17 MR. MARK WALSH: Okay. 18 MR. BILL STORM: Another question, sir? 19 MR. MARK WALSH: Oh, I've got hundreds of 20 them. 21 MR. BILL STORM: We're here all day. 22 MR. MARK WALSH: And I'm sure everybody 23 else has got questions, too. 24 I just wanted to make a comment about 25 when you made a mention of if you don't like the

1 looks of them, then your comment about that wouldn't have much impact on it. But I guess you'd really 2 need to look at individuals and I'm sure there's 3 4 others like myself that have -- I recently retired 5 and to a place where we -- it goes back 50 years when we bought the land. And through those 50 years 6 there's a lot of work and labor to make this land 7 retireable. 8 9 And once you get to that point, and then 10 they're going to put up these power lines next to 11 it, I think that should have some real impact 12 because it really impacts my life. So, yes, I will 13 put that in a comment on paper, but I think it has 14 just as much impact as any other concern. 15 MR. BILL STORM: Okay. 16 MR. MARK WALSH: Thank you. 17 MR. BILL STORM: You're more than 18 welcome. 19 Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gentleman, please, with the hand there, please come forward. State and spell your name, talk -- face the court reporter as much as you can do that.

MR. DAVE ROERICK: Thank you. My name is Dave Roerick, spelled R-O-E-R-I-C-K. I live here in Grand Rapids.

1 Just a simple question about compensation of impacts. Specifically, it looks like I have some 2 acreage that is in the preferred corridor, and I've 3 4 had crossings in the past from pipelines and stuff 5 that there was no compensation. And in my case, I'm a retired forester, and I have a love for trees and 6 7 timber, and there was no compensation involved. I'm wondering about compensation for timber that 8 9 would be harvested inside of that right-of-way. 10 MR. BILL STORM: Minnesota Power, do you 11 want to --12 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Sure. Jim Atkinson 13 again. 14 We do pay for right-of-way, of course. 15 And that is a fee that's equivalent to the fee value 16 of the land. So we're paying as if we're buying it, 17 but we're not, of course, actually buying it, we're 18 just getting an easement. And typically we do pay 19 timber damages as well. 20 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Jim. 21 Show of hands? Okay. 22 Darrell, please come forward, state and 23 spell your name, try to face the court reporter. 24 MR. DARRELL WHITE: Darrell White. 25 D-A-R-R-E-L-L, White, W-H-I-T-E, Bovey. And, yes,

that was my wife.

I have a couple concerns. I have a gas line already crossing my property. When Excelsion was going to come through, I don't know if they still are, they wanted to put another pipeline and a high-tension line across my property. And Nashwauk wanted to do the same. Now you're coming in. If all these projects come through, I only own 47 and a half acres, I won't have nothing. No woods, nothing left. And you want 200 and then another 50 feet for construction? It was in some of the paperwork we got.

You're going to pay to cross the property. And we keep getting this paperwork with two words in it, eminent domain. We don't have a choice. Are you going to pay us every year?

Because we got to live with this.

And I'd like to see an eagle study done.

Because at the end of 70 and 10, where 10 meets it,
is a state park for eagles. And last winter, when I
was shoveling off my roof, two eagles, treetop
level, flew over. I don't know if it was their
mating season or what, but they made a lot of noise.
I'd like to see that done.

That's about all I have. Besides, it's

1	going to, like the one gentleman said, it's going to
2	impact my property a lot. I'm on the blue.
3	Do you want to answer anything? Yeah,
4	that's what I thought.
5	MR. JIM ATKINSON: I guess I could
6	respond to the compensation. Jim Atkinson.
7	The answer about compensation is that we
8	pay a one-time easement payment, which is the
9	equivalent of the fee value.
10	MR. DARRELL WHITE: Yeah, but we got to
11	live with this.
12	MR. JIM ATKINSON: That's right.
13	MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Buy the Farm.
14	MR. DARRELL WHITE: I've got to wait for
15	another year, more than a year to find out the
16	route?
17	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Yeah. To know for
18	certain, yes.
19	MR. DARRELL WHITE: Well, I want out.
20	MR. BILL STORM: Show of hands?
21	Carol, I imagine you're going to touch on
22	the Buy the Farm?
23	MS. CAROL OVERLAND: And a couple other
24	things.
25	MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Carol spoke once,

so if there's somebody who hasn't spoken, I'll let 1 them go first. I'll get to you Carol. 2 Okay, gentleman, please step forward, 3 4 state and spell your name. Ron Gustafson. 5 MR. RON GUSTAFSON: G-U-S-T-A-F-S-0-N. 6 7 I have a question relative to existing 8 lines. Where the new line is proposed, will they run parallel to each other? Will the old line be 9 10 removed or will there be a double power line in this 11 corridor? And, if so, does that expand the corridor 12 further and how much and what's the impact on that? 13 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Jim Atkinson. 14 The answer is that they would be 15 Two separate circuits on two different parallel. 16 sets of structures. And, yes, the right-of-way 17 would have to be extended substantially for that. 18 MR. BILL STORM: Jim, is there a 19 potential for a little bit of overlap so you don't 20 need the whole 200 feet? 21 MR. JIM ATKINSON: In some circumstances 22 there is. But we would still have to add 23 considerable width. 24 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you. 25 Carol, come forward.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Carol Overland again. A number of things have been brought up that I do have some answers about.

The utility personal property tax, that is paid to the local governments and it is divided pretty much evenly between the county, the city or township, and the school district. So it does stay in the area.

The difficulty with that is, is that our friends at Xcel and other utilities have worked very hard over the last -- well, since 1994, late '94 into '95, to cut utility personal property taxes in every way possible. So it's way, way down from what it used to be. Probably down at least like 50, 60 percent from what it was prior to those cuts. So that's something that I think should be looked at as an economic benefit. The economic benefit of those utility personal property tax is not what it used to be.

You also should know that in the certificate of need there were questions about need and that is -- there's an intervention deadline coming up August 29th, that's in the certificate of need docket, that is docket -- PUC docket 12-1163.

Let's see. In the need, typically, you

know, there's the need docket at the state and there's the routing docket at the state. Typically the only place alternatives are reviewed is in the certificate of need docket, but here they're looking at alternatives because NEPA requires it. The question I have is, the NEPA alternatives that you're looking at, will that just be like alternative routes or will that be including system alternatives?

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: The way that the NEPA process works is that we evaluate what we call range of reasonable alternatives. This is defined in law as a specific meaning. Whether or not an alternative, whether it's a routing alternative or a suggestion to look at other generation sources, that would be considered in relation to what the purpose and need from the federal decision is. So that helps sort of define what that range of reasonable alternatives are that would be carried forward for a full detailed analysis in the document.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Okay. So then, translated, that would mean it is more than just routes?

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: It could be, yes.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Okay. Great.

Thanks.

The next -- oh, and the timing of this
FEIS release, that's a question that I have.
Because we've had a problem, and an order just came
down in the docket for the ITC, which the PUC rep
Mike Kaluzniak, noticed just came down where I had
to make a motion to get the FEIS included -- the
time extended for people to comment on the FEIS, the
adequacy of it in the Minnesota process. So I'm
wondering if the FEIS will be released prior to
public hearings on this and the evidentiary hearing?
Do you know about scheduling?

MR. BILL STORM: We had a prehearing conference with ALJ O'Reilly on Monday. And the way we're approaching it, the way that the EERA always approaches it is the final EIS will be submitted into the record following the public hearing and probably following the evidentiary hearing. The hearing record is usually kept open for the insertion of the final EIS. It is then up to the intervenors and the parties, when they interact with the ALJ at the prehearing conference, whether briefs and reply briefs that follow the evidentiary hearing, they can address the final EIS. But there will not be a separate comment period on the final

EIS.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And in the federal process we don't have the ALJ proceeding that follows. However, as I noted, you know, the draft environmental impact statement can be released, we often do get requests for extension of comment periods for folks to review the document and submit comments. We consider those and act accordingly, typically allowing folks, because this is a public process, to speak to that.

We on the federal side in our process, we release the final EIS. And as I talked about in my presentation a little bit, then there's a cooling-off period for folks so that folks can look at the final EIS, we do accept comments, and we consider those when we are determining what we're going to say in our decision document, which is the record of decision. So there is a 30-day period. There is an official request that would have to be made because oftentimes we're not making that decision determination on the 31st day. It depends on the complexity. It also depends on various factors.

Someone asked a question about reliability, and I just want to quickly hone in on

this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Department of Energy, in determining whether or not to issue a presidential permit, we have various pieces of information. One of those pieces, obviously, in the potential environmental impacts from issuing that permit, and the construction and operation of the line. But we also must look at the electric reliability and the impacts of this project on the grid and the reliability of the grid. That is another piece of information that also feeds into whether or not we will issue this presidential permit.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: So, then, on the federal side there will be, then, a 30-day opportunity at least to comment on the FEIS?

MS. CAROL OVERLAND:

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: Yes, ma'am.

Okav.

Thank you. That is not something the state is doing. But just for the record, the state is updating the rules for siting and certificate of need, and those do contemplate in 7850 that the FEIS be issued prior to the public hearings. And just for what that's worth. And it's not -- won't affect this, but that's common.

> And as for the mailing address. Ιt

sounds like maybe Minnesota Power has been using the parties' address and not the land location, maybe, for eliminating people from the list. So otherwise I just don't see why, you know, Linda Castagneri and Ron Gustafson wouldn't be on the list, and if they were eliminated, who else was eliminated? That's something that maybe you ought to take a look at.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: It's speculation, but I think what probably happened is they were on a previous list because we had broader corridors, and when it was reduced down to our narrower routes they were no longer within or adjacent. That's the likely explanation.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: But following up on that, please sign up on the mailing list related to the EIS, both for state and the DOE, and you will have access to receive timely information about the project and about the environmental analysis. So please fill out a card.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: And another issue that was raised is the people who have multiple corridors. This is a 500 -- or any corridor, if this is proposed on your land, this is a 500 kV line and people are able to utilize Buy the Farm, which is a statutory provision where people can say, look,

I don't want to live with this, I'm out of here.

Now, the problem is that the utilities fight it. I don't know how Minnesota Power will behave, Xcel has been fighting it at every turn and we've had to even go to the Supreme Court about this. Landowners are winning, but. So it remains to be seen how, you know, Minnesota Power will deal with that. But that is an option under the statute, to say you have to buy me out, I do not want to live with this. And then what happens is it ends up being a fight over how much it's worth, but that is an option that Minnesota does have and other states don't have.

And something that the EIS, I'm wondering if it does address, too, as far as waiting to know. You know, there's an issue of loss of marketability here, where people who are faced with this project, you can't very well sell because nobody is going to want to buy it if they don't know if there's going to be a transmission line here or not, and that's a problem. And that's an economic impact, it does affect people. So that's something that should be considered in the EIS.

And that's it for now. Thank you.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Carol.

1	Okay. Back to the pool. Show of hands?
2	Yes, sir, please come forward, state and
3	spell your name, face the court reporter.
4	MR. HARVEY WAHLQUIST: Harvey Wahlquist,
5	W-A-H-L-Q-U-I-S-T.
6	I'm not an opponent of progress, I think
7	it's a great thing, what our country is founded on.
8	I've got a comment about the substation.
9	I'm going to be your neighbor at that substation.
10	How big is it going to be?
11	MR. JIM ATKINSON: I believe that the
12	footprint is going to be probably, the fenced-in
13	area would be at least ten acres.
14	MR. HARVEY WAHLQUIST: Okay. How much
15	noise is it going to make?
16	MR. JIM ATKINSON: We do address that in
17	the route permit. I don't have the figures in front
18	of me, but at the distance that the neighbors are
19	from that site, I don't believe it'll be audible
20	from any of them.
21	DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: If I may also
22	address that. However, noise is an impact, it is a
23	resource impact that we do cover in the EIS, both
24	from construction and from operation of the line.
25	MR. HARVEY WAHLQUIST: The reason I ask

is because I can hear the substation that's there quite well already. And I'm told that this is going to be substantially more noise than what's there now.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: Well, I don't know if it'll be more noise than what's there now, but it will be a substantially larger substation.

MR. HARVEY WAHLQUIST: One other question here.

On the trees, the existing trees that are there. The proposal that I read, the blue route is going to take half of the 40 acres that I own there, the orange route will take all of the 40 acres that I own there. I don't understand the 200-foot easement.

My question is my trees are probably 25 to 30 feet tall now, I planted 'em about 12, 13 years ago, 14,000 pine trees I've got. How tall can they be before they have to be -- or will they affect the power line right-of-way if they all have to go. Thank you.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: Within the power line right-of-way we wouldn't leave anything that was 25 feet tall. 15 feet is about as high as anything could be. So the answer is everything would be

cleared within the 200-foot right-of-way.

And the difference between the route, of course, and the right-of-way, is that the route is an area that would be permitted to play host to a right-of-way, but the -- and so it's a lot wider than what the actual right-of-way would need to be.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Anybody else?

Questions?

Richard. Please step forward, state and spell your name again. Please keep the mic close to your mouth and look at the court reporter.

MR. RICHARD LIBBEY: Richard Libbey, R-I-C-H-A-R-D, L-I-B-B-E-Y.

I'd like to preface my remark saying I think we're fortunate to have Minnesota Power as our utility up here. They've always been a very responsible corporate neighbor and really look out for the area for us, I think. And Jim's been good to work with.

But on the compensation issue, Jim said that they'd pay fee title for the 200-foot strip that crosses your property. I'm wondering if they pay for the overall reduction in your property value. Because if you have a 40-acre piece that, say, is worth \$100,000 and they cross \$1,000 worth

of acreage, if someone buys the property, comes and says, well, you've got a big power line across there, I'll give you 60,000 for it. So I'm wondering in the compensation procedure, are they compensated just for the land that's impacted or do they compensate for resale value of the property?

Also, when the line is there, there's going to be maintenance going on, there's going to be herbicide application or else mechanical clearing, and there are going to be helicopter overflights to inspect the lines. And it's one issue, if they're paralleling another line, you think it would be more economical for them to parallel a line for maintenance reasons because you could do -- coordinate helicopter flights, even though different utilities own the lines. You could also coordinate your herbicide applications and line clearing.

And there was a question about how much of the lines are paralleled earlier. And I mentioned it earlier, but for clarification, when the two proposals, one, 30 percent of the lines are paralleled and on the other proposal only 38 percent, so about a third of the proposed route follows existing transmission lines.

Another point, in Itasca County I know it's a concern of the Itasca County, is that the proposed routes go right on the boundary of the Bass Lake County Park that's up by Bigfork, up by Effie. And if there's some way to work around that, I think it should be looked into. I know if they follow the existing corridor to the right it will be a moot point because it will bypass, you know, it won't be near the park anymore. So that's an issue of concern.

And also on the two, you know, proposed routes, the minerals expressed concern because it crosses Township 624 and 623 that are being actively explored for copper/nickel deposits. And I think that's another thing that should be considered.

And a question for Jim on the three types of structures that they're proposing. One is a freestanding one. These are similar to the ones you see if you go across the Big Bog on the way to Duluth there. It looks like a big scarecrow standing up with big arms going out, they're 140 feet high and, you know, really large power lines. But I'm wondering if there's one that's freestanding that wouldn't impact the avian birds as much, an owl flying through the night to catch a mouse, you've

got guy wires going down, it's less likely to hit a guy wire than a freestanding tower. I believe when they build in softer bog type areas I think they have to use the guy types, there's two of them illustrated there.

When you do build these, I'm wondering how they build it like in big bogs, way north here. I talked to a retired DNR person, and he said he was there when they built the existing line back in the '80s, I think it was. He said they had to do soil borings and they hit 14 feet of bog before they hit the ground. He said it was quite a procedure to build across, they were flying helicopters in with concrete buckets, pouring the footings and bringing the towers in. I'm just wondering exactly how you construct it and if you take into consideration bird impacts, you know, which type of tower you can get by with without impacting the wildlife so much.

And let's see. Oh, another thing that hasn't been mentioned is this is a cooperative ownership agreement with Manitoba Hydro. It's got a capability of carrying 750 megawatts. Minnesota Power has contracted for 250. Manitoba Hydro is the junior partner in the project, they're paying 49 percent of the construction costs, Minnesota Power

1 is paying 51. So the line has to be run longer, if 2 there is more expenses to acquiring property, I think it should be kept in mind that it won't be 3 4 entirely put on the backs of Minnesota ratepayers, 5 that Manitoba Hydro will be sharing the load. that might lighten the arguments about increased costs for different parts of the line. 7 And like Carol pointed out, a lot of the 8 9 power is going to be pass-through power. And the 10 lines impact mostly Lake Country Power customers, 11 they don't receive the power from Minnesota Power, 12 so basically the landowners on the route are 13 carrying the burden of the project and other people 14 are benefiting. 15 Thanks. Okay. 16 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Richard. Any 17 comment? MR. JIM ATKINSON: 18 No. Okay. 19 MR. BILL STORM: Back to the pool 20 again. 21 Darrell, please come forward. 22 MR. DARRELL WHITE: I just forgot one 23 thing. You don't have to run back, I got a loud

Like I said earlier, I have a gas line

24

25

voice.

running through my property. I have trouble with people coming in there bird hunting, deer hunting, snowmobiling, four-wheeling. How am I going to keep them out?

MR. JIM ATKINSON: Jim Atkinson again.

That's a concern a lot of landowners have, and we do work with landowners on gates and that sort of thing, so there's often ways that that can be restricted.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. The pool again?

Anyone? Anyone have additional comments? Have

questions?

I want to remind you that in the back my man, G, has the GIS station set up. If you want to call up an aerial photo of your property and on the back of that you can make comments if you have a concern. If you want G to help you come up with a route or possible route alternatives, I encourage you to do that.

I want to let you know that many people have made comments that push it to the east, put it to the west. If you want to put an alternative on the table, you need to work with me, work with G within the comment period and hammer out a defined alternative route segment that you would like me to

consider.

When I get general comments, push it to the east, or push it to the west or to the north or the south, there's not much I can really do for that because that puts me in the position of developing a route for you, and that's a lose, lose for me. I'm not going to do it right for some reason.

But what I would be willing to do is to sit down, come up here, meet with you. You can certainly work with G. And we can help you work out something reasonable to get around whatever area and concerns you have to get around.

I'm going to go back to again to the pool. A question? Anybody? A question, comment?

MR. BOB WALSH: I just had --

MR. BILL STORM: Please stand up, state and spell your name.

MR. BOB WALSH: Bob Walsh, W-A-L-S-H.

How many power lines are now existing that come across our borders?

MR. BILL STORM: Just Minnesota?

MR. BOB WALSH: Minnesota, yes.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: The answer is there's currently a 230 kV, one of those, and one 500 kV line.

1	MR. BOB WALSH: So there are two other
2	lines that come across already.
3	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Right.
4	MR. BOB WALSH: And they can't use those
5	existing lines to come across and
6	MR. JIM ATKINSON: No, those are at
7	capacity.
8	MR. BOB WALSH: At capacity, meaning the
9	wires are at capacity, but not the routes. I mean,
10	you could widen one of those 100 foot and come
11	through there with different lines, additional
12	lines?
13	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Yeah. I mean, we are
14	following those same circuits in different places.
15	And some places we're not for various reasons.
16	MR. BOB WALSH: One other question is,
17	again, I'm not a power individual, so why do these
18	towers need to be so tall?
19	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Because you have to
20	maintain minimum clearances at the midpoint.
21	MR. BOB WALSH: And why is that?
22	MR. JIM ATKINSON: That's roughly 40
23	feet.
24	MR. BOB WALSH: And why is that?
25	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Because it's a high

1	voltage transmission line.
2	DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And there are
3	height clearance requirements that are required.
4	MR. BILL STORM: Electrical code.
5	DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: I'm sorry?
6	MR. BILL STORM: Electrical code.
7	DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: Exactly, electrical
8	code, and it's based on reliability.
9	MR. BOB WALSH: So these are at, did you
10	say, 75 feet, or 130?
11	MR. JIM ATKINSON: No, these would
12	probably average 140 feet tall.
13	MR. BOB WALSH: 140 feet.
14	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Right.
15	MR. BOB WALSH: And then I guess I just
16	don't get, they need to be 140 feet from the ground.
17	MR. JIM ATKINSON: It's not 140, it's at
18	the midpoint where you have the sag in the line.
19	It's down to about 40 feet or 41 feet, something
20	like that.
21	MR. BOB WALSH: I see. Thank you.
22	MR. JIM ATKINSON: Yep.
23	MR. BILL STORM: Thank you.
24	Back to please stand, state your name,
25	if you want to speak.

2 3

4 5

7 8

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

again.

24

25

MR. CAVOUR JOHNSON: I just had -- Cavour Johnson. I just had one other question.

Through Itasca County there's two routes, the preferred and the alternative. Is there a chance that those would ever be -- and they cross each other. Is there ever a chance that one portion of one would be used and a portion of the other in this process?

MR. BILL STORM: That is certainly a possibility. And when the Commission gets to their final decision point and they're looking at the whole record, the EIS, the public hearing, the evidentiary hearing, all the comments we receive, they could very well pick a route that follows the blue route for so many miles and where it intersects with the orange, pick up the orange, and then when it intersects with the blue, go back to the blue. mean, they're going to balance all these portions of the line as well as taken as a whole. So that could be a possibility.

> MR. CAVOUR JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Back to the pool

Yes, Richard, you want another shot? Please state and spell your name and speak Okay.

loudly.

MR. RICHARD LIBBEY: Okay. It'll just take me one second. Richard Libbey, R-I-C-H-A-R-D, L-I-B-B-E-Y.

I do have a map here of the existing power lines if anybody wants to look at a map after the meeting concludes.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. And I do believe, G, you could call up, when people come up to you to the back and the computer, you can lay on transmission lines, SNAs, whatever they want. So please utilize G, he'll be here all day.

Okay. Another --

MR. RICHARD LIBBEY: I was just going to say, this map was added as an attachment to Minnesota Power's application, so it is online also.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Richard.

Once again, back to the pool. I really encourage you, I'm not making fun of you, I want your comments. Any comment? Any more comments?

Okay. Remember August 15th. You have my contact information, so if you're struggling with -- and if you made oral comments tonight, you can certainly follow up with written comments. If you're struggling at some point to how do I

formulate this comment, Bill, or help me work this out, give me a call, I'll work you through it.

And the same thing goes with routes, if you've got an issue that you want to try to avoid, G will certainly work with you back there, but as we approach the comment period I will also give you any assistance that I can and walk you through it.

I'm going to come back to the pool for going once, twice.

Okay. I really appreciate you coming out. This is what this process is all about. I do get a lot of local knowledge from, as you can see when I went through my alternatives, and what the Commission has done with things that come up through scoping, it does have a positive effect. So, please participate, remember the comment period. I want to thank you for coming out. Please utilize G as much as you can stand, and thank you.

(Meeting concluded at 1:04 p.m.)